

## Remarks

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on March 30, 2007. Claims 29-36 are standing for examination. Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 29, 31, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sassin et al. (US 6,058,435) hereinafter Sassin. Claims 30, 32, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sassin.

In response to the Examiner's rejections and statements, applicant herein amends the independent claims to overcome the 101 rejection and to clarify subject matter regarding agent skill tables and skills required to service a task. Applicant also provides arguments which clearly show that Sassin fails to teach or suggest all of applicant's claim limitations, as amended and argued.

Applicant herein amends independent claims 29, 31, 33 and 35 to recite a system which provides a means/code for determining the skill set that would be best suited for responding to the task in response to the task being prepared for service; then providing means for building a skill table of all available agents having skills at least partially matching the skill set determined to be best suited to service the task.

Applicant argues that Sassin builds and maintains one agent table. Tasks are then received, skills determined for the tasks and the entire agent table is then accessed to determine the best agent to service the task. Applicant points out that it is especially advantageous and efficient to determine skills required in a task *and then* to build a table of all available agents having skills that at least partially match the skills required to service the task. Only with the claimed system can the proper efficiency, organization and data processing occur to determine the best agent to service the task. In this manner a unique table is generated only of agents having skills matching the skills of the required

task. Then the skills of the agents are further narrowed to determine the best agent to handle the task. In applicant's invention a complete database search of every agent for every incoming task need not occur, as in the art of Sassin.

Specifically, as seen in Fig. 3 of Sassin, step 58 generates a skills table of skills possessed by each agent, step 60 generates an agent's table and step 62 generates a résumé-details table. These steps are taught as "set-up" steps prior to routing incoming communications (col. 8, lines 26-54).

Sassin then teaches; "After the three tables have been formed in steps 58, 60 and 62, the skills inventory database 48 of FIG. 2 has the information necessary for skills-based communications routing. This information is accessible by the skills correlation device 44. In step 64, an incoming communication is received at the information distribution system 10 of FIG. 1." (col. 9, lines 23-27)

As clearly seen above Sassin agent generates tables prior to receiving a communication for routing. Applicant understands that the PTO has upheld basic requirements of anticipation in that it is not enough to require that the disclosure in a single prior art reference disclose all of the claimed elements, rather, as stated by the Federal Circuit, anticipation requires the presence in a single disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the recited claim. Surely applicant expects method claim 29 to be examined wherein art is applied according to the steps as recited in order. Sassin fails to teach skills determined in an incoming communication prior to the agent table which is accessed to determine and match skills of an agent, as claimed.

Applicant argues that Sassin fails to teach all of limitations recited in applicant's independent claims in the order claimed; therefore the 102 rejection fails as a prima facie case of anticipation has not been shown. Applicant believes claims 29, 31, 33 and 35 are

clearly patentable over the art of Sassin. Claims 30, 32, 34 and 36 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended upon a patentable claim.

As all of the claims have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that the case be passed quickly to issue. If any fees are due beyond fees paid with this amendment, authorization is made to deduct those fees from deposit account 50-0534. If any time extension is needed beyond any extension requested with this amendment, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Joseph B. Agusta

By /Donald R. Boys/  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.  
3 Hangar Way, Suite D  
Watsonville, CA 95076  
831-768-1755